



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

This new Japanese programme calls for the construction, in the five years from 1917 to 1921, of 4 dreadnoughts, 6 cruisers, 10 destroyers, and 9 submarines. This requires an expenditure of \$95,000,000 in five yearly installments.

Compare this with the great naval programme recommended by Secretary Daniels, and you will see how modest the Japanese plan is. The American programme calls for the building of 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 50 destroyers, 15 seagoing submarines, 85 coast defense submarines, 4 gunboats, 1 hospital ship, 2 ammunition ships, 2 fuel-oil ships, and 1 repair ship. This entails an expenditure of \$422,964,087 in the five years from 1917 to 1921—that is to say, four times the sum required by the Japanese plan.

This enormous expenditure provided for in the American programme is only for the ships to be built hereafter. To it we must add \$48,518,127 for the completion of the dreadnoughts now under construction, \$6,000,000 for naval aviation, and \$25,000,000 for reserve ammunition. All in all, the five years' programme calls for an expenditure of \$502,482,214.

Presuming that both the Japanese and American programmes were carried out as they have been formulated, the relative strength of the navies of the two countries at the end of 1921 will be as follows:

**The Japanese Navy.**—Eight dreadnoughts, 4 battle cruisers, 15 battleships of the pre-dreadnought type, 10 cruisers, 60 destroyers, 27 submarines.

**The American Navy.**—Twenty-seven dreadnoughts, 6 battle cruisers, 25 battleships of the pre-dreadnought type, 20 cruisers, 112 destroyers, 151 submarines, 24 colliers.

A glance at this summary reveals that the American armada will be about three times as powerful as the Japanese squadron. But the figures are misleading.

When we consider that the American ships are equipped with a larger number of more powerful guns than are the Japanese vessels, that most of the American destroyers and submarines are seagoing, that the American navy is better supplied with fuel ships and other auxiliary ships—when we consider all these conditions, it would seem that the American navy would have almost four times the strength of the Japanese navy by the end of 1921.

But what would be the comparative strength of the American navy should Congress reject the administrative naval measure, while Japan pursued the programme which she has adopted?

In that case America will undoubtedly follow the principle laid down in the programme of October 19, 1903, and repeatedly emphasized by Mr. Roosevelt and Ex-Secretary of Navy Meyer. The result would be that by 1921 the American navy would have twice the strength of the Japanese navy, instead of four times, as is expected from the adoption of Secretary Daniels' programme.

Those who fear, or pretend to fear Japan's "navalism" point to the Anglo-Japanese alliance and warn that, in the event of rupture between Japan and the United States, Great Britain would throw the whole weight of her great navy on the Japanese side of the scale. These wiseacres are ignorant that Great Britain has entered into a general arbitration treaty with this country, and that the Anglo-Japanese alliance contains the following provision: "Should either high contracting party conclude a treaty of general arbitration with a third power, it is agreed that nothing in this agreement shall entail upon such contracting party an obligation to go to war with the power with whom such treaty of arbitration is in force."

## MILITARY TRAINING IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

By ROBERT C. ROOT

PACIFIC COAST DIRECTOR OF AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

**T**HE State of California has at the present time 279 high schools. Of this number twelve have organized cadet companies of not less than forty pupils in each company, as authorized by State law. Several high schools have two or three cadet companies, since there are all told twenty-five military companies in the twelve high schools and 1,300 boys, fourteen years and upwards, taking military drill.

The total enrollment of boys and girls in the high schools of the State is 76,429. The boys alone number less than half, or 36,218, and 1,300 of these boys are in the cadet drill companies.

It is the belief of the writer that the teachers of California, as a class, are more nearly "100% pure" on the peace question than any other class of people in the State. Numbers of high-school principals and teachers are strongly opposed to military drill in their schools. Still, it is probable that there would be more military cadet companies in the high schools of California if more of these schools had a sufficient number of boys

(40 or more) to organize a drill company. The seven or eight private military schools of the State may, in some sense, supply the so-called "need" in this respect.

The twelve schools having military drill among their students have nearly or quite 8,000 pupils; hence the total number in the military companies is slightly less than one-sixth of the whole enrollment, or about one-twelfth of the number of boys enrolled. In one school nearly one-half of the boys are in the military companies, while in another larger school one boy in fifteen or more takes military drill. The captain of one company in this school—the Oakland Technical High School—told me it required much work to keep up the interest in the military companies. They were formed within the last year.

The provision for military drill in the high schools is found in three enactments of the California State legislature. The first act was approved April 5, 1911, and provides that "High Schools May Establish Military Companies;" provides for the organization and equip-

ment of such cadet companies and for the promotion of rifle practice therein. The sum of \$5,000 was appropriated for this purpose. This act also provided that only those schools that had 40 or more boys fourteen years of age and over could have military drill, as each company must have at least forty members.

This provision excludes probably 104 of the small high schools, whose daily attendance of boys does not average forty for each school. Furthermore, the opposition of school principals and trustees to military drill still further increases the number of schools that have no military companies. Any person familiar with the schools of California knows that there is considerable opposition of that sort. Would that there were more!

The act of April 5, 1911, was amended May 18, 1915, and again May 20, 1915. The first of these amendments provided for the appropriation of \$13,000 for defraying the expenses of the high-school cadet companies for two years. The act of May 20, 1915, provides somewhat in detail for the equipment (obsolete rifles for drill, Springfield rifles for target practice), for uniforms, for officers, for U. S. Army drill regulations, and for supervision and inspection by the adjutant general of the State. The young boys are thus brought into close relations to the National Guard and occasionally, at least, with U. S. Army officers. The reason why is perfectly obvious. They seek to captivate the young minds with the pomp and glitter of military life.

Although the majority of these high-school military companies were organized before the European war began, nevertheless the persistent agitation for "preparedness" on the part of the United States has caused several new companies to be formed; probably five of the twenty-five now existing were organized after August 1, 1914. Several others were attempted, and thus far have failed through lack of interest on the part of the pupils.

Moreover, in three large cities of the State there were recent attempts to introduce military training in the schools. In Oakland the plan failed in one large school because some parents objected, the Socialists in particular, and the students were too busy with better things and were not captivated by the so-called "benefits" of military drill, though the principal of the school strongly favored it. In San Diego the board of education decided "to table" the plan presented to them by some ardent advocates of military instruction. Los Angeles had a lively "fight" on the subject before it was defeated. The peace victory seemed to hang in the balance for some time. A member of the board of education, who is, or was, a major in the National Guard of California, introduced a resolution in favor of *compulsory* military drill in Los Angeles schools. This aroused much opposition. The resolution was modified twice, and finally defeated by the board of education by a vote of four to three.

For this "famous victory" much credit is due to the able leadership of Mrs. R. J. Waters and ex-Judge Waldo M. York, of the board of education, and also to the efficient co-operation of Mrs. E. C. Bellows, chairman of the Woman's Peace Party; Mrs. Seward A. Simons, president of the Friday Morning Club; Gen. E. C. Bellows, president of the Southern California Peace Society; Mr. Reynolds E. Blight, former member of the board of education, and several other able helpers

who opposed the attempt to militarize the schools of one of our largest cities.

It may be of some interest to some readers to learn that only one public high school in southern California maintains military cadet companies—the Los Angeles High School. Four others in the same city have none. There are, however, three private military schools in the city. There is another private military school near San Diego. The remaining eleven public high schools that have military drill are the following: Alameda High School, with 660 pupils and three drill companies, with approximately 150 cadets; Auburn High School, 206 pupils (1914-1915) and one or more companies; Gilroy High School, 135 pupils; Marysville High School, 175 pupils; Oakland Technical High School, 1,900 pupils and two cadet companies, with 125 cadets; Sacramento, 1,171 pupils; San Francisco, three—Commercial High School, 1,159 pupils; Mission High School, 579 pupils; Technical High School, 575 pupils and one or more drill companies; Visalia High School, with 234 pupils, and San Jose, with nearly 1,300 pupils.

California peace workers need to work strenuously and pray devoutly that the number of cadet companies and the number of immature boys now taking military drill in the schools of the State may not increase, but rather decrease. If this comes to pass our peace forces must be alert and must not fall asleep "on guard."

## THE CAUSE OF MODERN WARS

By DARWIN J. MESEROLE

CLOSELY allied to the question of military preparedness is the cause of wars—especially of the present great war.

It will be conceded that the European war is neither religious nor racial in its origin. There remains the other and most vital cause of international strife—the struggle for commercial supremacy in the markets of the world. It is here that we shall find the germ, or tap-root, of modern war. Germany's demand for "her place in the sun" is more than an imperialistic ambition; it is a natural and, under the present system of world commerce and industry, necessary right, to which she is entitled by her unprecedented development as a nation since 1870, in education, literature, art, music, government, industry, and commerce. The recognition of this right should lead us as vigorously to condemn the German nation's assent to the Bernhardt and Nietzsche doctrine of force and the approval of violations of solemn treaty obligations, while it is not difficult to understand when we consider the coalition of her three enemies, Russia, France, and England, unnatural because only an exigency of commercial or financial interest, which knows no law and has no sentiment, could bring together autocratic Russia, with its massacres and pogroms, and democratic England and France.

Under the modern system of industry, the profit and wage system, the workers of all the highly developed manufacturing and agricultural nations receive in wages but a fraction of what they produce, even in the United States. The surplus goes to those in every country who own the capital, the factories, the land, and other means of production and distribution. The workers, who are the market and consuming power of a nation, being un-